CENSURA CENSURÆ:

OR,

A JUST CENSURE

OF THE

UNJUST SENTENCE

OF THE

BAPTISTS

UPON AN

APPEAL

Made against

Mr. *HENRY D'ANVERS.*

By *OBED WILLS.*

Nil contra— fidem amici causâ vir bonus faciet, ne si Judex quidem erit de ipso amico ponit enim Personam amici, cum induit Judicis. Nam si omnia facienda sint quæ amici velint; non amicitiæ tales, sed conjurationes putandæ sunt. Tull. 3. Offic.

LONDON,

Printed for *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Golden Lyon in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1676.

A JUST CENSURE
OF THE
UNJUST SENTENCE
OF THE
BAPTISTS
UPON AN
APPEAL
Made against
Mr. HENRY DANVERS.

THE PREFACE.

MR. Danvers *in his* Rejoynder, pag. 1. *tells the World, that he hath* therein given a full Anſwer to my Vindiciæ: *And in his Preface,* a ſerious and particular Anſwer to my groundleſs and frivolous Appeal, *as he is pleaſed to call it. And to aſſure me his Party is of the ſame mind, he adjoyns the* * Baptiſts *Anſwer in his Vindication. And both* he *and* they *do put me in mind of my Promiſe, that if he could make it appear I had wronged him (as they think he hath ſufficiently done) I would make him publick ſatisfaction by acknowledging my Miſtakes. To the performance of which, I can truly ſay, I have no Antipathy, ſince to yield to the Truth is a glorious Victory; and if my Antagoniſt convinceth me of my Errors, I ſhall not come behind him in Honour, when I openly Retract them.*— * Nam ut ille mei Victor eſt, ita ego triumphator Erroris.

* Mr. *Knollys*, Mr. *Kiffen*, Mr. *Dyke*, Mr. *Goſnold*, Mr. *Forty*, Mr. *Delaune*.

* Minutius Fœlix.

I have ſeriouſly, and as I think, with a great dea of Impartiality, examined what they have ſaid: And find that through their own miſapprehenſions (to put it in the mildeſt terms) I am moſt apparently abuſed by them all. And if Men would but take ſo much pains, as to examine both our Books, and the Authors we quote, they would diſcover what I ſay to be true, without a farther Vindication. But becauſe few have either Will, or Leiſure ſo to do; for the juſtifying of my ſelf, the undeceiving others, and the making good my Promiſe, which they urge me withal, I am neceſſitated to appear once more in this Cauſe: And having finiſhed my Anſwer to Mr. Danvers *his* Rejoynder, *intended it forthwith for the Preſs. But an unexpected Providence hath fallen out, to alter thoſe Intentions for the preſent. And I hope the Party will be more Ingenuous than to apprehend any thing beſides Civility, occaſions the delay. But the* Baptiſts *Anſwer is ſo flung in my Teeth, and I am reproached as not able to ſay any thing for my ſelf, that I am forced to publiſh this firſt, which I intended laſt. And therefore if I am now more particular in thoſe diſcoveries that reflect Ignorance and Partiality upon the Party, it muſt be imputed to the clamorous Reproaches of ſome envious Spirits, that will not be quiet.*

A Vindication of the Appeal.

THE *Baptiſts* Anſwer to *my Appeal* againſt Mr. *Danvers*, is as if they were reſolved to manifeſt themſelves to be indeed what Mr. *Danvers* miſtakingly calls them, *viz. Appellants*. Is not the *Appellant* the ſame with * *Actor?*

For they Accuſe me of what was never brought to their Bar for Sentence, as 1.) My refuſing of accepting an endeavoured Accommodation. (2.) The unuſualneſs of my Method. (3.) The unlikeneſs of my Pattern. (4.) The impropriety of my *Appeal*, *pag.* 2. All which they borrow from Mr. *Danvers* Preface to his *Reynder*. And no doubt he might therefore well ſay as he doth, that he wrote to help the *Appellants*, *pag.* 21. But what to do? Rather to give *his* Judgment, then their *own* in Matters brought to their Bar by me in my *Appeal*, but preſently brought back again by them to his.

To which I anſwer. (1.) That neither Mr. *D.* nor his Party, have any reaſon to be offended at my refuſing that Accommodation they ſpeak of, for the publiſhing his Miſtakes to the World, did re-

* *Appellans dicitur Actor Sir* Henry Spelmans *Gloſſary in verbum Appell.* *Appellant is the Plantiff in the Appeal*, Minſhaw.

quire as publick a Detection. And all the Injury I have done Mr. *D.* is only to Undeceive him, by demonſtrating he was miſtaken, if indeed he thought *his Book beyond any Rational-Objection againſt it*; and ſo give him an Opportunity of making good his promiſe, *That if it could be made appear he had done any manifeſt Injury to Truth, he would be ready to give the moſt publick ſatisfaction it might call for.* And if indeed the Detection of his Error is *as welcome to him as an Approbation* (as he ſpeaks) *it being only Truth and Sincerity he deſigned to propagate:* His next muſt contain his Retractations, by which he will give a ſufficient proof of his Sincerity. But if inſtead thereof he ſhall ſtill continue to juſtifie himſelf, and reproach me, I am afraid his greateſt profeſſion of Sincerity, will ſcarcely perſwade the impartially Judicious to believe him. (2.) Any Man may uſe his own Method. There are general Rules for the framing of Diſcourſes, but they bind none to the ſame way of procedure: And where there is no Law againſt the form of my *Appeal*, there can be no Tranſgreſſion. (3.) The Pattern followed was for an *Appeal*, and that preſident uſed to excite the ſame Perſons (from whom was expected righteous Judgment) to ſecond their firſt Works. (4.) Why ſhould it be thought improper to appeal, but in the caſe of the *Appellatees* Contumacy? 'Tis certain that Circumſtance is not neceſſary, becauſe it is not in the definition of an Appeal; which is no more (ſay Lawyers) than *Provocatio iniquæ ſententiæ querelam continens*; and the end thereof is the redreſſing an Injury. But if the *Appellants* would ſeriouſly

ously have considered things as they ought, they might have seen good Cause for this my way of Procedure. For though I told Mr. *D.* in my first Book, *pag.* 24. That *Luther* had no such passage in his 3 *Tom. pag.* 168. as he quotes, 2. *Edit. p.* 8. Yet in his *Reply*, he will not own his Mistake, Though I shewed him, *Cap.* 7. *page* 2, 3. that he made the *Magd.* say, pag. 47. *That the Custom of Dipping the whole Body, was changed into Sprinkling a little Water on the Face*; which they did not: Yet in his *Reply* he justifies himself, by saying, *They are his own words, not theirs* (which proves my Charge) though there is but a Semicolon between: And that *in his second Edition, he made a distinction, by putting those words into a different Character*; which is untrue. Though I told him, *Cap.* 7. *pag.* 2. that the *Magd.* did not say, *That the Apostles Baptized only the Adult*, as he made them, *pag.* 46. Yet instead of confessing his Mistake, he falls foul upon me in his *Reply*, pag. 31. as if *I had charged a Falshood upon him of my own making*. For (saith he) my words are expresly thus: *The Magd. tell us that in this Age, they find they Baptized only the Adult.* Though I acquainted him in my Preface, that the *Magd.* did not say, *Cent.* 3. *pag.* 125, 126. that the Custom of Dipping was changed into Sprinkling, as he affirmed, 1. *Edit. pag.* 113. Yet *Reply, pag.* 36. he cryes out, *I do him manifest Injury; for he did not quote those Pages for that, but for the superstitious Rites*: though it was impossible for any Reader so to understand it, as I demonstrate, *Vind. pag.* 58. And at last (though these are such apparent Mistakes)

ſtakes) in the Preface to his *Reply*, he tells me, *That notwithſtanding my great Flouriſh and Noiſe, I am not able to reprove the truth, ſo much as of one of thoſe Authorities in the Hiſtorical part, and excepting one in the Doctrinal, not another that is conſiderable in the whole Book.* Doth not Mr. *D.* in theſe things appear to be *Contumacious and Stubborn*, ſo *as to reject and ſtand out againſt juſt Conviction* and Admonition? Indeed the *Baptiſts* tell me, *They do not find him juſtly chargeable therewith*, pag. 2. But I hope by this, they will be ſenſible of their overſight, and be convinced that my Appeal was both proper, and ſeaſonable. I am ſure the Inſtances carry ſufficient Demonſtration in them, to ſatisfie all the impartially Judicious, if they will be at the pains to examine them as they lie in his Treatiſe.

II. I obſerve that *their Anſwer* is almoſt *a Capite ad Calcem*, of Mr. *D's.* forming; which argues *Colluſion*, and that they conferred Notes before they thought meet to proceed to Sentence. Let us compare their *Anſwer* with his *Rejoynder*, and it will be apparently diſcovered.

Mr. D's. *Rejoynder*, *p.* 25.	*Baptiſts Anſwer*, p. 4, 5.
Speaking of my Tranſlating a piece of Calvin; *queries whether I did* fairly *in ſtopping the Tranſlation where I did; that it might appear to thoſe that underſtood not* Latine *to be ſo groſs as I would make*	They mentioning the ſame Matter, deſire me to conſider, whether the ſtopping of my Tranſlation where I did, be not unfair, and the miſleading of an *Engliſh* Reader; which is all one as to ſub-

make it; and this is ſubmitted to my Conſcience.

Pag. 30.

Mr. D. *cenſures me for Diſingenuity, becauſe I told him of miſtaking Æ-*tius *for* Calvin, *after he had owned the miſtake.*

Ibid.

Mr. D. *excuſeth himſelf about this miſtake, and ſays, that in looking into his Book he finds he did put* Eſtius Annot. Gen. 17. 7.

Pag. 33.

Mr. D. *tells me I dealt unworthily in leaving out the word* [Parvulis] *in my Tranſlation of* Waldens *words, which Mr.* D. *cites in the* Latine: *Noſtri*

ſubmit it to my Conſcience.

Pag. 6.

They ſpeaking of my Charge againſt Mr. *D.* for abuſing *Calvin*, and fathering *Eſtius's* words upon him, cenſure me as one neither Fair nor Ingenuous, becauſe he had owned it as a Miſtake in his Reply.

Ibid.

They make the ſame excuſe for him, *viz.* We obſerve alſo that he quotes *Eſtius Annot. Gen.* 17. 7. at the end.

Pag. 8.

They alſo muſt needs remark the ſame, telling me that I left out [*Parvulis*] and with what deſign or end they leave me to conſider, and then

Cite

Noſtri wickliviſtæ, &c.	Cite the words in *Latine* as Mr. *D.* doth.
Pag. 30.	*Pag.* 7.
Mr. D. *puts a ſpecial mark upon thoſe words of mine. No wonder Mr.* D. *miſtakes* Latine *Authors ſo often, when he cannot rightly underſtand thoſe that are in* Engliſh.	They cannot give in the words of Dr. *Hamond* without this addition, *viz.* We hope this will convince you of the untrue and unjuſt Reproach you ſubjoyn, That he underſtands not *Engliſh* Authors.

To which may be added their Accuſations above mentioned, which truly render them *Appellants*, taken from his Preface. Do not theſe Inſtances demonſtrate, that they conſulted with the Party accuſed for a Sentence, it being thus by Parts pronounced in his own words: (And let them deny it if they can) Which is certainly a greater Impropriety than can be found in my Appealing, which they condemn. It being contrary both to Reaſon and Honeſty, that a Judg ſhould be ſwayed by the Dictates of a Party, or enquire for a Sentence at his Mouth.

III. I further obſerve, that there is much in their dealing with my Appeal, that looks like Partiality; and in their Sentence that hath (to ſay no more of it) an appearance of reſpect of Perſons. We are ſome-where told by *Eraſmus*, that προσωπολημψία, *Eſt cum magis favemus huic quam illi*

illi non ob ipſius rei, ſed Perſonæ diſcrimen. And *Zanchy* tells us, that this *Perſona non ſignificat ſubſtantiam hominis ſed qualitatem*; and that *qualitas* is carnal Relation, Riches, *Sameneſs of Opinion*, or (in a word) any thing the Judges reſpect beſides the Cauſe. Now this appears,

Firſt, In remarking to me ſome things in my *Appeal*, as Falſe and Injurious, or Unfit, and paſſing by in ſilence ſome things in Mr. *D.* that are of the ſame or like nature. The ſtopping of my Tranſlation out of *Calvin*, was, ſay they, unfair, *pag.* 4, 5. Yet Mr. *D.* ſtopping his Tranſlation out of *Beza*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is not unfair, nor worthy of blame, for they take not the leaſt notice of it, though mentioned in my *Appeal*, pag. 167, 168. My charging Mr. *D.* with adding thoſe words to *Jerom*, viz. For it cannot be, *&c.* is, ſay they, unfair, *pag.* 5. But Mr. *D.* his adding to the *Magd.* to *Beza*, to *Ames*, mentioned in my *Appeal*, pag. 164, 165, 167, 168. is paſſed by without any Cenſure, though his Anſwers to them are not only weak, but untrue. My charging Mr. *D.* to have abuſed Doctor *Hammonds* words, is Cenſured by them *for my Miſtake*, pag. 7. but his abuſing and perverting of *Voſſius* his words, mentioned *Appeal* pag. 180, 181. is paſt over in ſilence, though the Miſtake is ſo notorious, and Mr. *D.* juſtifies it to the height. Laſtly, my leaving out [*Parvulis*] in *Waldens* Quotation, muſt be remarked to me, with an inſinuation that it was done with an evil Deſign, *pag.* 8. But Mr. *D.* his Omiſſions out of *Bellarmine*, Doctor *Owen*, Doctor *Field*, *Olimpiodorus*, mentioned in my *Appeal*, pag. 162, 163, 164,

164, 176. were all, it ſeems, made with an honeſt Deſign, for they are not remarked to him.

Secondly, In giving their Judgments, only upon part of my *Appeal*. For as for the ſtrange Doctrines I charge Mr. *D.* withall, they ſlightly *Anſwer*; *We think they do not ſo properly offer themſelves to our Conſideration*, pag. 14. and therefore conclude, *they may be excuſed if they wave them*. But why them more than the reſt? *As being* (ſay they) *things controverted, and collateral to the grand Propoſition*, pag. 13. This doth well mend the Matter. (1.) Things controverted: So were the particulars they paſs Sentence on. (2.) Collateral: So was that part of the *Milevitan Decree*, *Item placuit*, &c. taken notice of by them, *pag.* 9. So is that Queſtion, whether Mr. *D.* abuſes *Calvin*, by fathering the words of *Eſtius* upon him, *pag.* 6. and the addition of the *Virgin Mary*, to the form of Baptiſm; and yet theſe were thought worthy of their notice. But what they ſay is *untrue*, for they are not all Collateral to the main Queſtion— if that be it, whether *Infant-Baptiſm* be warranted by the Scripture; For ſeveral of the falſe Doctrines mentioned, have a direct influence upon that Queſtion: And out of thoſe Doctrines which are contrary to his, are Arguments drawn for the Proof of the lawfulneſs of *Infant-Baptiſm*; as may be ſeen in thoſe Writers that undertake its Defence.

Thirdly, In taking Mr. *D*'s. words for *Anſwers* to ſome of the particulars in my *Appeal*, and for *ſufficient Anſwers* to the *Inſignificant* and *Trivial* things, (as they are pleas'd to word it) I lay to his

his Charge, *pag.* 3. And ſo are all thoſe Particulars which they do not remark unto me, according to this their Vote: That is, Mr. *D.* hath anſwered all but Eight, which they think fit to take notice of from *pag.* 8. to the end. But if Mr. *D.* his Anſwers may excuſe them from taking notice of the reſt, it might alſo have given them a Diſcharge from the labour of their Remarks; he having remarkt the ſame before, and they making but a Repetition of his Anſwers.

Fourthly and Laſtly, In taking in Mr. *Thomas Delaune* to ſit Judg with themſelves upon my *Appeal*, though by the high *Encomium* he gives (in his Epiſtle to Mr. *Hutchinſons* Book, and Verſes before it) of Mr. *D.* his Works, his great Contempt of my ſelf, and all that have wrote againſt him, and confining the Church of God within the narrow limits of his own Party, as if they were the only *Chriſticolæ* in the World, he hath ſo openly made himſelf a Party in the Cauſe. To admit a Perſon ſo apparently byaſſed, ſo virulent in his Scoffs, and ſo *unqualified* for the examination of *Latine* Authors that he is not able to form * *Suſtineo*; is certainly againſt all rules of Juſtice, and proclaims their Partiality to the World. And if I may be allowed liberty of Conjecture, I preſume this *Gentleman* was *The Perſon* they pitched upon to examine the particulars of my *Appeal*, who by his Ignorance, hath

* *This* Delaune *undertakes to Propheſie, that after Mr.* Baxter, *Mr.* Whiſton, *and my ſelf, none ſhall ſtand up in the defence of Infant-Baptiſm, for thus he chants:*

——Nec unquam
Cauſa patrocinio *ſuſtinuenda*
novo eſt.

hath brought them to justifie Mr. *D.* his Addition to the *Muscovitan Canon*, by a passage found in *Perverusto codice*; that, indeed, is so far from being the same there-with, that it speaks the contrary, as I shall soon demonstrate: Which greatly reflects upon them all, though some of them I am satisfied have Learning enough to have discovered the Mistake, had they but considered it themselves.

Having thus manifested the *Partiality* of the *Baptists*, and therein discovered how unlike just Judges they have proceeded, I shall address my self to a more particular Answer.

The *Baptists* tell me, *That what Mr. D. acknowledges, and what are Inconsiderable, and what they particularly examine, comprehends my whole Appeal*, pag. 4. So that all those which he hath not *Confessed*, nor they *Examined*, are *Inconsiderable, Trivial, Insignificant, that deserve not to be mentioned; and his Answers to them respectively, are deemed sufficient to satisfie the Reader*, as they declare, *pag.* 3. By which they make Mr. *D.* his Answers their own; and consequently if any of them prove Insufficient, their Reputations are blemished as much as his; yea, abundantly more, they standing in the capacity of Judges. I shall therefore shew,

First, That some of Mr. *D.* his acknowledgments, are not so Ingenuous as they make them, *pag.* 3.

Secondly, That some of those Particulars in my *Appeal*, which they say are so Trivial and Insignificant, that they deserve not to be mentioned, are not indeed, so Inconsiderable as they make them. And that Mr. *D.* his Answers which they make

make their own, are very Inſufficient to ſatisfie an Impartial Reader.

Thirdly, I ſhall more eſpecially conſider thoſe eight Particulars of my *Appeal*, they have thought good to inſiſt upon; in all, or moſt of which, they juſtifie Mr. *D.* and condemn me. And ſhall make it appear, I hope, to their own Conviction, that had they acted with that *Impartial* inveſtigation after Truth therein, as became *juſt* Judges, and good Chriſtians, they would have paſt a contrary Sentence.

And I muſt deſire the Reader to take notice, that the Reaſon why I here only inſiſt upon ſome of the Particulars in my *Appeal*, and not all, is not becauſe I judg the reſt not as capable of Vindication: But having done it already in my Anſwer to Mr. *D.* his *Rejoynder*, which I hope may ere long be publiſhed; I chuſe to inſiſt only upon ſo many at preſent as may be ſufficient to Demonſtrate what I have undertaken to prove.

1. In the firſt place I am to prove, that Mr. *D.* his Acknowledgments are not cloathed with that Ingenuity as the *Baptiſts* pretend: To demonſtrate this, I muſt examine his Confeſſions. He owns, indeed, *Rejoynd. pag.* 35. That that paſſage of *Nazianzen*, *Baptizandos peccata ſua confiteri ſolitos*, ſhould be rendred, *The Baptized were wont to confeſs their ſins*: Which in his *Treatiſe*, *pag.* 56. he Tranſlated, *None were Baptized of old but ſuch*: But yet he juſtifies this Tranſlation to the height: Which is a confeſſing the Fact, and yet denying himſelf guilty, and is this Ingenuous? Again, he confeſſeth, *Rejoynd. pag.* 32. That *Deus dedit* (a

Popes

Paper Name) appearing to him to be two words: and not the name of a Man; he rendred it *Deodans*, or *Gods-Gift*. But this savours little of Ingenuity, for though he acknowledgeth his Error, in rendring *Deus dedit*, by *Deodans*; yet there is another Error in it not acknowledged, and that is rendring *Deo-dans*, Gods-Gift; *a Deo-dand* (which is that he means) is something given to God: See *Minshaw* on the word. It is true, I minded him of the first Mistake, but the chief thing I brought the Instance to prove, was, his making Authors to affirm one thing, when they affirmed the contrary; for as he translated the words, the Reader will presently conclude, that these Gifts were given by the Baptized to the Church, (and might happily guess thereby that none were Baptized but the Adult) whereas indeed they were given by the Church to them, as I demonstrate, *Appeal, pag.* 171. But this he takes no notice of: And is this Ingenuous? Or what he saith upon it, a sufficient Answer for the Readers satisfaction, as they affirm?

Thirdly, He acknowledges, *pag.* 32. That as to the Quotation out of *Walden*, *I have truly rectified his mistake therein*. But adds, *That it was harmless* (though directly contrary to what *Walden* affirmed) *and undesigned: And that I have done it to his advantage, as confirming more fully that* Wickliff *and his followers were against Infant-Baptism, in agreement with the* Albegois *and* Silvester, *in* Scotland: Two other harmless Mistakes. For *Walden* tells us plainly, that he wrote that 53 *Chap.* against an Upstart sort of Hereticks, to prove

Quod

Quod parvuli de neceſſitate ſalutis Baptizentur aquâ ſenſibili; That is, that Infants were to be Baptized with Water as neceſſary to their Salvation. This *Wickeliff*, and the *Albegois* denied, for which he branded them as Hereticks, as judging thereby Eccleſiaſtical-Baptiſm unprofitable to Infants, becauſe they held they could be ſaved without it. But how doth this confirm more fully, they were againſt *Infant-Baptiſm?* When Proteſtants that are for it, are of the ſame Judgment, *viz.* That it is not of abſolute neceſſity to Salvation, that a Child ſhould be Baptized. And as to his *Sylveſter* in *Scotland*, *Walden* mentions no ſuch Man: He only tells us of certain *Lollards*, *Sylveſtris Scotiæ*, of the High-lands of *Scotland*, that were of *Wickliff's* opinion in this matter: And is this *Ingenuous* in Mr. D. or *Ingenuous* in the *Baptiſts*? Who applaud the Ingenuity of his Anſwers, and never examined the Hiſtory of theſe things, and yet have undertaken to judg between us.

Fourthly, He confeſſes, *pag.* 41. that he did father upon *Zonaras*, that which he did not ſay; and yet calls my charging him with it a trifle. And doth this argue Ingenuity?

Fifthly, He acknowledges his miſtake about *Lawnifranks* Teſtimony, to prove *Berengarius* denied *Infant-Baptiſm*, pag. 46. But I told him alſo in the ſame place, *Appeal*, pag. 188. That the *Magd.* did not tell us, that he publickly maintained denying Baptiſm to Infants, though he poſitively affirms it, 2 *Edit. pag.* 241. I told him alſo that though he inſinuated, *pag* 243. that *Berengarius* recanted his Opinion of Infants Baptiſm,

and after wrote against his own Recantation: Yet there was not a word of *Infant-Baptism* therein, nor any thing like it; both which he takes no notice of. And how then can Mr. *D.* satisfie his Conscience, in telling the Readers in his Post-script, that he there gives them a brief Account of all the Mistakes of moment, that he hath met with from any hand: And can any Man call this *Ingenuous?* Lastly, He acknowledges the mistake about *Siricius*, as being too plain to be evaded. But presently adds: But what Decrees were made by *P. Siricius*, so immediately preceding *Innocent*, for Infant-Baptism, as Mr. *Wills* supposeth, I find not, *pag.* 48. Though indeed, I neither said, nor supposed any such thing. And is not all this very *Ingenuous?*

2. I shall in the next place prove, that some of those Particulars in my Appeal, which the *Baptists* say are so *Trivial*, and *Insignificant*, do not indeed deserve those Epethites: And that Mr. *D*'s. Answers, which they make their own, are very Insufficient to satisfie any Impartial Reader. (1.) I having charged Mr. *D.* with leaving out part of what his Authors say, to make the Sentence more for his purpose, prove it by particular Instances; one whereof is mentioned, *Appeal*, *pag.* 162. taken out of his *second Edit. pag.* 95. where he leaves out *Bellarmines* owning, that it *is openly enough gathered out of the Scriptures, that Infants should be Baptized*; and quotes him, as if he only pleaded Apostolical Tradition for the Practice. And this I made appear he did, knowingly, and on purpose, because Mr. *Tombes* inserts it, from whom he

he had the Quotation. Again, I produced another Inſtance of like nature, *pag.* 164. out of his *ſecond Edit. pag.* 755. Where he inſinuates the ſame of Doctor *Field*, who yet as poſitively declares *the Scripture to deliver to us the grounds of* Infant-Baptiſm, which he alſo omits. Do not theſe Omiſſions make the Quotations more for his purpoſe, and ſo ſubſtantially prove my Charge? How then come they to be *Inconſiderable, Trivial, Inſignificant*, as the *Baptiſts* affirm? Why Mr. *D.* makes Anſwer for them, and tells me, *Rejoynd. pag.* 25. *They were omitted from my own Grounds, becauſe he there quotes both of them under the Head of Tradition; they both aſſerting* Infant-Baptiſm *ſo to be. But when he ſpeaks to the Head of Conſequences from Scripture*, he ſaith, *he quotes them both, as Reply*, pag. 74. Anſwer, (1.) He ſaith, *He did it from my own Grounds*; becauſe of that ſaying of mine, *Vind. pag.* 7. But he attempts not to make it good; neither indeed can he. (2.) *He quoted them under the Head of Tradition:* Which is untrue. For the Quotation of *Bellarmine*, is in *pag.* 95. and belongs to the firſt *Chapter* of his *ſecond Part*, the contents whereof run thus, *viz. Wherein the Scriptures total ſilence about* Infant-Baptiſm *is obſerved, with the neceſſity of Scripture-Warrantry, to Authorize every Ordinance, and that by the confeſſion of Parties themſelves.* And under the neceſſity of Scripture-Authority to warrant, *&c.* he quotes *Luther, Calvin*, and others, to prove it; and *at laſt* tells us, *he will conclude* the Chapter with that notable Obſervation of *Bellarmine*, which is the Inſtance before us. Is this then under the Head

of Tradition? No, but under ſuch a Head that he could not with an honeſt heart have made the Omiſſion. For he is proving, that every Ordinance muſt have Scripture-Warrantry. *Bellarmine* ſaith, Infant-Baptiſm is evidently proved from the Scripture, and brings three Arguments to prove it; all which muſt be left out, to poſſeſs the Reader that the *Jeſuite* pleaded Tradition only for the Practice. Is this a ſatisfactory Anſwer? And then as to that of Doctor *Field*; it is true, he quotes it under the Head of Tradition; yet it is, as owning Tradition to be the *principal Ground of Infant Baptiſm*; as may be ſeen in *ſecond Edit pag.* 132. and *Reply*, *pag* 72. Whereas Dr. *Field* owns no ſuch thing. He only ſaith, it is called a Tradition, becauſe it is not expreſly delivered in the Scripture: He doth not ſay, that Tradition is the principal thing leaned upon to prove it; neither could he intend ſo, becauſe he preſently adds, *The Scriptures deliver* to us the Ground of it, which Mr. *D.* omits. And his ſaying that under the Head of Conſequences, *Reply*, *pag.* 74. he quotes both this, and that of *Bellarmine*, is another miſtake; for that Page is not under the Head of Conſequences, *&c.* but under the Head of Tradition, as may be ſeen *pag.* 72. and in *pag.* 73, 74. *&c.* where he runs a Parallel between the Church of *Rome*, and me, in the behalf of the Proteſtants, in the point of Tradition, about Infant-Baptiſm: To ſhew our agreement therein. I acknowledg Mr. *D.* there tells us, that *Bellarmine did own it might be gathered from the Scripture.* But this is not ſufficient to excuſe his omitting of it in the other

other place; for this is another Book, and done to another end. But that he quoted *Field* there owning it also, is another mistake, to give it no worse a Name: For *Field* is not so much as mentioned in that 74*th* Page, nor any where else in any of his Book, that I can find to that purpose: How then can this be deemed satisfactory? Or could any thing but extream Partiality ever overcome Rational Creatures to affirm it, much less Christians? I must desire them seriously to consider it.

Another Instance I gave, *Appeal, pag.* 163, 164. taken out of his *Treatise, Second Edit. pag.* 176. where he brings a Passage out of Dr. *Owens Saints Perseverance, to prove that by the Seed mentioned,* Gen. 17. 7. *is meant the Spiritual Seed, and not the Carnal Seed.* Whereas Doctor *Owen* in that very place expressly saith, that the *External Administration of the Covenant of Grace was given to* Abraham *and his natural Seed*; which Mr. *D.* leaves out: And is it *Insignificant*, and *Trivial* in me, to reprove him for so great unfaithfulness? How can they prove it? Why it is our belief (saith Mr. *D.* for *them*, in his *Rejoynd. pag.* 26.) that the External Administration of the Covenant, *viz.* Circumcision did belong to *Abraham*, and his Carnal Seed, the *Jews*, under the Legal Administration, yet it follows not therefore, that Baptism belongs to the Carnal Seed under the Gospel-Dispensation. And therefore the *emitting* that phrase, which is not at all disputed between us, could not be from any injurious Design. But all this proves not my Instance *Insignificant* and *Trivial*: For the thing

Mr. *D.* had undertaken to prove, was, That the Seed there mentioned, was the *Spiritual*, and not the *Carnal* Seed, (it was not whether Baptiſm belonged to the Carnal Seed under the Goſpel Diſpenſation, as Circumciſion did under the Legal, that is Mr. *D*'s. miſtake) and he brings in Doctor *Owen* to confirm his Aſſertion; whereas the Doctor ſaith the contrary, *viz.* That the External Adminiſtration of the Covenant of Grace was given to *Abraham*, and his Carnal Seed, and the Internal Grace of it to all the Elect; that is, his Carnal Seed was by God owned to belong to his Viſible Church or Kingdom, till they Diſcovenanted themſelves, as *Iſmael*, and *Eſau* did; and all the *Elect* among the Seed that died in their Infancie, were made partakers of the effectual Grace of it. Whether Mr. *D.* had an injurious Deſign in this Omiſſion, he beſt knows: And whether his *Reply* proves the Inſtance *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*, let the Impartial now judg.

2. I charging him with adding to Authors, without the diſtinction of a different Character to the deceiving of the Reader, prove it alſo by particular Inſtances. One whereof is mentioned, *pag.* 167. taken out of his *ſecond Edit.* pag. 44. where he ſaith, That *Lydia and her Houſhold believing in the Lord, were Baptized at* Philippi *by* Paul, *Acts* 16. 14. Whereas there is not the leaſt mention in that Verſe, or Chapter, of the Believing of her *Houſhold*. I thought it had been a clear Proof of my Charge. But Mr. *D.* and his *Appellants*, judg the Inſtance *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*, *and not an adding to the Scripture, but his own*

own ſenſe of the words, concluding only Believers in her Houſhold were Baptized, *Rejoynd. pag.* 29. And is this a ſufficient Anſwer? Let the Reader judg, whether this doth not more ſubſtantially prove Mr. *D.* guilty of an Untruth, than my Inſtance *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*. I alſo brought another Inſtance out of *Beza*, and another out of *Ames*, *Appeal* 167, 168. And let the Impartial Reader but view them in his *Treatiſe*, *ſecond Edit.* pag. 169, 177. and judg whether his Additions to them are eaſily and very plainly underſtood, not to be his, by any ordinary Reader, as he affirms, *Rejoynd. pag.* 29, 30. ſo as to render theſe Inſtances *Trivial and Inſignificant, as the* Baptiſts *ſay*.

3. I charging Mr. *D.* with Self-Contradiction, brought one Inſtance, *Appeal, pag.* 173, 174. out of his *Treatiſe*, *ſecond Edit.* pag. 162, 163. where he tells us in one Page, *That the Holineſs mentioned*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *intended a Civil Matrimonial Holineſs, appears from the ſcope of the place. The* Corinthians *Queſtion being, Whether their new Spiritual Relation to Chriſt did not diſſolve their Carnal Relation*, &c. *And whether they could without defilement, maintain their Converſe any more than they could in* Ezra's *and* Nehemiah's *time? And yet in the very next Page, he tells us, That the Apoſtle brings in thoſe words* [*Elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*] *as an Argument*, ab abſurdo, *why they ſhould continue together.* Upon which I told him, that if the Ground of their ſcruple did really ariſe from thoſe Inſtances of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, it was a plain Contradiction to make thoſe words, *Elſe were*, &c. an Argu-

ment *Ab abſurdo:* Becauſe from thoſe Inſtances they could conclude no otherwiſe, but that their Children were Baſtards, and to be put away. But this is alſo judged by them to be *Trivial* and Inſignificant, *it being no Contradiction which is only an Alluſion to thoſe in* Ezra's *time, Similies not running on all four*, Rejoynd. pag. 33. And by their leave, Mr. *D.* doth not bring it in at all as a Simily, but makes it the very Ground of their Scruple. Let M. *D.* and his Party (thoſe of them I mean, that know what an Argument *Ab abſurdo* is) but exerciſe their Reaſon about this matter, and again affirm it *no Contradiction* if they can, and the Inſtance *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*. Again Mr. *D.* tells us in his *Treat. ſecond Edit.* pag. 231. That about the Year 610. Childrens Baptiſm was held in many places of little eſteem: And yet in his *Reply*, pag. 140. He tells us that Infant-Baptiſm was univerſally received in the *7th Age* in thoſe very places, to beget their *Regeneration* (as he phraſeth it) as I demonſtrate, *Appeal* pag. 174, 175. This alſo is branded by the *Baptiſts* as *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*, *being no Contradiction*; *becauſe* Infant Baptiſm *might be univerſally received, and yet in many places be little eſteemed.* (1.) *Becauſe Perſons may little eſteem things they receive.* (2.) By *Univerſal, he explains himſelf to mean the* Greek *and* Latine *Churches, which admit of exception*, viz. *Thoſe that ſubmitted to the Pope, and thoſe that were under the Patriarcks.* But this is far from reconciling the Contradiction, or proving the Inſtance *Trivial:* For as to that firſt, it is meer *Prevarication:* For let the Reader but view the place, *ſecond Edit.*

Edit. pag. 231. and he will clearly ſee that by *little eſteemed*, Mr. *D.* plainly intends publick Oppoſing; yea, he ſo explains it. And as to the ſecond, ſetting aſide the untruth of his Explanation, it is meer *Gibberiſh*, not to be underſtood by any but himſelf.

4. I charging him with perverting the ſenſe of his Authors, by the falſeneſs of his Tranſlations; bring an Inſtance, *Appeal, pag.* 180. out of his *ſecond Edit. pag.* 110. where he tells us from the *Magd.* That *P. Innocent* blaſphemouſly attributed Divine Honour to the *Popedom*, whereas they only ſay, he ſeemed to attribute Divine Honour to the Saints. This is *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*, ſay the *Baptiſts*, and no miſrepreſentation ſaith Mr. *D. Rejoynd. pag.* 38, 39. *Becauſe he ſingled out* Peter, *and whether he did it to Pope* Peter, *or Saint* Peter, *is not much material, the former is probable.* I, but what now is become of the *Popedom*, to which he ſaid *Innocent* attributed Divine Honour? And is it indeed probable, he attributed Divine Honour to Pope *Peter*, when the *Magd.* do expreſsly ſay 'twas to Saint *Peter*, without any mention of *Pope*. But 'tis not *material*, he ſaith, to which of them 'twas done. Anſwer, (1.) Though it be not material as to the evil of *Innocents* Fact, yet it is as to the meaning of the *Magd.* and to queſtion whether the Tranſlation be right or wrong. (2.) The Invocation of Saints (the Divine Honour given by *Innocent* to *Peter*) was long uſed before *Innocents* time, and before *Popery*, and the *Popedom* were formed, as now it is, or was in his days. *Voſſii Theolog.* pag. 176: *ad.* pag. 208.—

So

So that one would wonder Mr. *D.* ſhould thus betray his weakneſs to give ſuch *Anſwers*; but for his Party to own them, as *ſufficient*, is telling the World they have renounced their Reaſon. Another Inſtance I gave in the ſame Page, taken out of his *Treatiſe*, *ſecond Edit. pag.* 118, 119. where a Quotation out of *Voſſius* is moſt groſly perverted. Mr. *D.* making him give theſe *as the Reaſons why the Antients Baptized naked*, viz. *That they might be therein as in a ſtate of Innocency, and as naked in their ſecond, as firſt Birth*, &c. Whereas *Voſſius* only uſeth thoſe Expreſſions, to ſhew how naked the Body was when they Baptized it: And how doth this prove the Inſtance *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*? Yea, rather it proves the *Baptiſts* extreamly *partial* or inconſiderate.

5. Having charged him with fathering upon Authors, that which indeed they ſay not, at leaſt in the places by him quoted; do in my *Appeal*, *pag.* 181. produce an Inſtance out of his Treatiſe, where having told us, *ſecond Edit. pag.* 55. *That the* Magd. *give us ſeveral Authorities out of the Learned Fathers, to prove what he there affirms, and ſome whereof you have as follow.* (That is, according to the *Grammar* of the words, thoſe Quotations that follow, are ſome of thoſe the *Magd.* produce.) And among the reſt, *pag.* 66. he brings *Arnobius* upon the *Pſalms*, which the *Magd.* have not, as he himſelf confeſſes, *Rejoynd. pag.* 41. And denies he did ſay he took it out of the *Magd.* which is a palpable untruth. And yet Mr. *D.* muſt be juſtified, and the Inſtance condemned as being *Trivial* and *Inſignificant*.

6. I

6. I charging him with picking out of Authors here and there, and joyning them together as if they were one intire Sentence, gave four particular Inſtances for the proof of it; all which were pertinent, and full, as the Reader will ſee if he pleaſe to peruſe them in my *Appeal*, *pag.* 184, 185. The laſt of which was taken out of his *Reply*, *pag.* 63. where he patches together words ſpoken about a hundred Pages diſtant from each other, and upon ſeveral occaſions, to make me ſay, *That Infant-Baptiſm may be lawful, becauſe not forbidden in the Scripture*; which I no where did affirm, nor indeed did I ever think it. But he tells me, *Rejoynd. pag.* 43. (and the *Baptiſts* in him) *That he hath done me no wrong, and deſires the Reader to judg whether in thoſe Pages compared, I do not ſay, That tho there is no Scripture expreſly commanding, ſo neither is there any excluding Infants from Baptiſm, nor any Scripture that ſaith there were no Infants Baptized.* I confeſs I ſay ſo, and what is this to the purpoſe? But do I here, or any where elſe affirm Infants-Baptiſm may be lawful, becauſe not forbidden in the Scripture? He cannot ſay it, and ſpeak truth. And yet Mr. *D.* muſt be juſtified, and this Inſtance be branded with the Epethites of *Trivial*, *Inſignificant*, and *Inconſiderable*.

7. I charging him with aſſerting notorious Untruths, give an Inſtance of one out of his *Treatiſe*, *ſecond Edit. pag.* 115. where he affirms from the *Magd. That a Child that died Unbaptized in the* 7th Cent. *was taken up and Chriſtned, and had his Fathers name given him*; and in his Margent puts it, *a dead Child Chriſtned*, to make Infant-Baptiſm look

look the more ghaſtly. Whereas the *Magd.* ſay, not that he was taken up, and Baptized dead, but after he came to Life again, he was Baptized. Having found Mr. *D.* guilty of a double Untruth, 1. In the Tranſlation, 2. In the Story. He will not confeſs his Fault, but uſeth many turnings and windings to bring himſelf off, *pag.* 44. (1.) 'Tis ſaid, he conceives there is no untruth in his rendition of the words: Yet there is; for the Tranſlation anſwers not the Original, which is this, *viz. Is puerum ſine Baptiſmo mortuum, reſuſcitarit ex mortuis & tandem Baptizarit:* Rendred thus by Mr. *D. A Child that died Unbaptized, was taken up and Chriſtned.* And is there no difference betwixt *taken up*, which might be ſpoken of a dead Child, and he, *raiſed up from the dead*; which is the true rendition. (2.) He ſaith, if he ſhould intend the Child then dead when Chriſtned, he knows no reaſon but he may have his liberty of Conjecture, as well as Mr. *Wills.* True, a liberty of Conjecture is granted in a doubtful caſe; but not a liberty of Contradicting the words of an Author, or ſaying he ſays what he ſays not; ſo doth he here, in concluding from the *Magd.* the Child dead when Chriſtned: For *Reſuſcitare ex mortuis*, is never uſed but to raiſe to Life; and he, and his Party will do well to ſhew in what Author the word *Reſuſcitare* (without *ex mortuis*, and taken by it ſelf) is uſed to ſignifie, a taking up from among the Dead, or out of the Grave, a dead Body: which if they be able to effect, yet will it not ſerve their turn, unleſs they can ſhew the whole Phraſe [*Reſuſcitare ex mortuis*] will bear that

ſenſe

ſenſe. Mr. *D*'s. Reaſons are Inſignificant, and (perhaps) one of them another Untruth: Becauſe (ſaith he) ſuch an Interpretation ſo exactly agrees with their Practice, then uſual, to Baptize the Dead: What, To take their dead Bodies out of the Grave, and Baptize them! for he ſaith, the Boy was taken up, that is, out of the Grave, as appears by his following words: And how will he prove it then their uſual Practice to Baptize the Dead? Indeed *Marcion* and the *Cataphrigæ*, notorious Hereticks, were for ſuch a Practice in the ſecond *Cent.* (as the *Magd.* tell us) but that ever it was a general Practice in the Church either then, or in the *7th Cent.* as Mr. *D.* affirms, is, I preſume, more than can be proved; nay, I am apt to think he cannot find it practiſed by any. Another reaſon of his ſtrange Interpretation of *Reſuſcitare ex mortuis*, is caſt into the form of a *Querie*.—— Why may not the Dead be ſometimes uſed for the *Grave*, as the Grave is often *Metonymically* uſed for the Dead and Death? as he ſays he could Inſtance in great variety.— Be it ſo, yet except he can alſo Inſtance in like Variety, that the Dead is uſed for the Grave, he ſays nothing; nor yet any thing to the *purpoſe*, unleſs he ſhew ſuch a Figure muſt be uſed here in the Rendition and Interpretation of the *Magd.* But notwithſtanding all this, Mr. *D*'s. Party (to the great Diſparagement of their Learning amongſt all Scholars that ſhall read it) pronounces my Exceptions againſt him in this alſo *Trivial* and *Inconſiderable*, and his Anſwer to be *Satisfactory*. Another Inſtance I took out of his *Treatiſe*, *pag.* 113. *Edit.* 2. where he affirms,

That

That the Anabaptists, *or* Waldensian Sect, *increasing in* France *and* Spain, *King* Theodoricus *called a Synod at* Illerdon *in* Spain, *decreeing that those that were fallen by* Anabaptism, *the Order of the* Nicene Synod *should be imposed upon them*, viz. *That they should pray seven years amongst the* Catechumens, *and after that two years amongst the* Catholicks, *before they be admitted to the Eucharist.* I told him in my *Appeal*, *pag.* 191. that this was untrue. And being demonstrated to Mr. *D*'s. Conviction, he hath only this to say for himself, *Rejoynd. pag.* 47. That he quoted it out of the *Dutch* Book of Martyrs, and if they have mistaken it, let them be accountable for it, saith he, not I. Which is another untruth; for he quotes the *Magd.* for it, and not his *Dutch Martyrologie*, as the Reader may see in his said *Treatise*, *pag.* 114. This also is censured by the *Baptists*, as a *Trivial* and *Insignificant* Instance: And a notorious Untruth, judged a sufficient Answer to it.

8. I charge him with strange Doctrines, and prove it by Instances: One out of his *Treatise*, *Edit.* 2. *pag.* 156, 157, 158. where he affirms, *That Infants have not habitual Faith, or an inspired Habit.* And *pag.* 213. That they are uncapable of Regeneration. This I undertook to prove false Doctrine, *Appeal*, *pag.* 193. if Mr. *D.* continued to justifie it, and his Party approved his so doing, which concern'd them to take notice of. And again, *pag.* 171, 172. he asserts, *That nothing is a Seal of the New-Covenant, but the Holy Spirit*; and again, *pag.* 212. he denies that *Persons may be visible Church-Members before Conversion*: all of them Do-

Doctrines apparently false: And I presume the *Baptists* themselves do so judge, which makes them so willing to wave the Consideration of them, *pag.* 14. But notwithstanding they must be pronounced *Trivial* and *Inconsiderable*, and his Answers to them sufficient. Of which, let the Readers judg.

9. I am come to Vindicate those particular Instances, which the *Baptists* think worthy their *Remarks*; though these also, if I mistake not, they censure as *frivolous*. For thus they preface their *Remarks*, pag. 4. *We must observe to you that you lie Obnoxious to the return you made to Mr* D. *when he charged you with leaving out part of the Sentence of* Nazianzen, *viz.* Si aliquid periculi immineat; *Calling it a frivolous Charge: Excusing your self after such a manner as you will not be satisfied with from others; therefore we say, many of your Charges are frivolous, your Reason in your own behalf will justifie us, you being Judge. And therefore, first,* (say they) *we desire you to consider*, &c. I shall not be angry with the *Baptists* for calling any of my Charges *frivolous*, that indeed are so: But I confess, I think never the worse of them for their calling them so, nor will I believe the Impartial Readers judg them *such*, unless they can prove them so to be. And as to my leaving out *Si aliquid*, &c. which both Mr. *D.* and his *Appellants* upbraid me withal: I answer; That in my *Infant-Baptism* asserted, *Cap.* 7. *pag.* 10, 11. I did plainly declare it to be *Nazianzen's* Opinion, that Infants ought to be Baptized presently in case of danger of Death, otherwise to stay two or three years: And therefore the leaving

out

out *Si aliquid periculi*, &c. could not be out of an ill intent, but for brevity, as the *Etcætera* added, makes it further appear. And as to that Paſſage, *pag.* 13. which through ſome miſtake I know not how, was fathered upon *Bazil*, to prove him for Infants Baptiſm, when the words were *Nazianzens*; I have already, and do once more, declare that it was not out of Deſign; and indeed my Anſwer which I ſent to a Trepanning Letter which Mr. *D.* cauſed to be ſent me, argues my Innocency: for therein I tell him, that I knew not where to find the words ſpoken by *Bazil*, and could not refer him to any Book, or Page, as was deſired. And therefore it is a moſt uncharitable ſurmize of Mr. *D.* that I left out ſome words on purpoſe that it might not be diſcovered to be *Nazianzens*. And now let the Reader judg of the *Frivolouſneſs* of the Anſwer. But as for the *Baptiſts*, their extream Partiality makes me regardleſs of their Cenſure. I have diſcovered it, I think, pretty well already, and in examining their remaining *Remarks*, I ſhall make it more abundantly appear.

Firſt then, They deſire me to conſider *pag.* 4. *Whether the ſtopping of my Tranſlation out of* Calvin *where I did*, Appeal pag. 62. *be not unfair, and a miſleading an* Engliſh *Reader?*

Anſw. I having accuſed Mr. *D.* for leaving out part of what his Authors ſay, to make the Sentence more for his purpoſe, produce an Inſtance out of the *ſecond part* of his *Treatiſe*: The thing he there undertakes to prove, was, *The Scriptures total Silence about Infant Baptiſm, by the confeſſion of Parties themſelves*, as appears by the Contents of the *Chap.*

pag.

pag. 39. and in *pag.* 91. he brings in *Calvin*, confeſſing that it is no where expreſly mentioned by the Evangeliſts, that any one Child was by the Apoſtles hands Baptized. I told him in my *Appeal*, *pag.* 162. that *Calvin* did in that very place affirm, that *Infant-Baptiſm* was not framed by Man, but upheld by the great Approbation of Scripture: And the leaving out this, was that I accuſed him of; and appealed to the *Baptiſts*, whether this Omiſſion did not make the Sentence more for his purpoſe. For how could Mr. *D.* without bluſhing, have brought *Calvin* confeſſing the Scriptures total ſilence about *Infant-Baptiſm*, had he at that ſame time mentioned his affirming the Scriptures to approve it. This was ſo full a proof of my Charge, that the *Baptiſts* ſaw, I preſume, that if they took Cognizance of it, as they ought to have done, they muſt for ſhame have pronounced him guilty: And therefore they paſs it by, and inſtead of Condemning him, as they ought, they accuſe me, as being guilty of the ſame. But doth my being guilty, make Mr. *D.* innocent? Is it *unfair*, and a *miſleading* of an *Engliſh* Reader in me, and not in Mr. *Danvers?* Certainly if one is guilty, then both: And why then muſt my Fault alone be remarked? It ſeems their affections to their *Champion*, would not ſuffer them to be ſo juſt. But indeed what they charge me withal, was neither *Unfair* nor *Miſleading* an *Engliſh* Reader. For I tranſlated ſo much as might ſatisfie any that had the uſe of their Reaſon, that *Calvin* owned that it was no where expreſly mentioned. The [*for although*] with an *&c.* clearly implied it, and my asking Mr. *D.* whe-

whether it was fair, thus to mangle *Calvins* ſentence, and take only the latter part of it, which he calls the Objection of Fools; fully prove that I grant he ſaid ſo, though he looked upon it as an inſignificant Objection. And therefore Mr. *D.* telling me, *Rejoynd. pag.* 24, 25. That I intimate it was not *Calvins* ſenſe, [*viz.* That it is no where mentioned expreſly, that any one Child was Baptized] is a great miſtake, to ſay the beſt of it; and Mr. *D.* himſelf might bluſh to mention it.

2. They tell me, pag. 5. *That whereas in my Appeal,* pag. 166. *I charge Mr. D. to have added theſe words,* [*For it cannot be that the Body ſhould receive the Sacrament of Baptiſm, till the Soul hath before received the Truth of Faith*] to *Jerom's*: Upon their examining the place, they find them *to be* Jeroms *words verbatim. And they obſerve that in my quoting Mr. D. I add* Magd. Cent. 4. *Cap.* 6. pag. 418. *As if he had particularly quoted the* Magd. *there, which he doth not, but only* Jerom *upon* Matth. *which double Injury they conceive deſerves my double conſideration, in order to a candid Acknowledgment.*

Anſw. Who ſo blind as they that will not ſee. Had they but once conſidered the place in my *Appeal*, they would preſently have diſcovered, that I did not compare what Mr. *D.* ſaid, with what *Jerom* ſaid, but with what the *Magd.* tell us, he ſaid, *Cent.* 4. *Cap.* 6. *pag.* 418. For Mr. *D.* in his 2. *Edit. pag.* 55. ſaith, *The* Magd. *tell us,* Cent. 4. *That it was the Univerſal practice to Baptize the Adult upon profeſſion,* &c. *and for which,* ſaith Mr. D. *they* [the Magd.] *give us ſeveral*

Autho-

Authorities out of the Learned Fathers, some whereof, saith Mr. D. [That is some of those Fathers they mention] *we have as follow.* And among the rest, brings in *Jerom* upon *Matth.* pag. 56. saying, *The Lord commanded his Apostles, that they should first instruct all Nations, and then Baptize them in the Mystery of the Faith.* This the *Magd.* quote, *pag.* 418. But Mr. *D.* adds; *For it cannot be,* &c. Which the *Magd.* have not; and for this I accuse him. And therefore though I said they are none of *Jerams* words, Mr. *D.* and all that read it considerately, could not but understand my meaning to be, as quoted by the *Magd.* for so Mr. *D.* tells us they were, which renders him guilty of what I charged him withal, though they find the words *verbatim* in *Jerom*, because he pretended to take them out of the *Magd.* where they are not to be found. So that I conceive this double Charge of the *Baptists* against me, deserves their *double Consideration* in order to a candid Acknowledging they were mistaken in the Matter.

3. They tell me, pag. 6. *That I charge Mr.* D. pag. 169. *with abusing* Calvin, *fathering* Estius's *words upon him, though he hath owned it a mistake in his Reply. But we observe also* (say the Baptists) *that he quotes* Estius's Annot. Gen. 17. 7. at the end, *which you leave out, though you took all his words to that,* and yet reprove him so often for the same; which seems neither Ingenuous nor Fair.

Answ. Unless they could have produced something more they significant, had better have forborn the *Remark.* The thing I charged Mr. *D.* with, is indeed sufficiently proved by his own confession. But this it seems was neither *Fair,* nor *Ingenuous,* that I should leave out *Estius Annot.* at the end, and yet reprove him so often for the mistake. But when the *Baptists* shall consider, (1.) That I have reproved Mr. *D.* for this mistake but once, as I remember, since my first Book came out, to wit, in my *Appeal,* upon his Brag of the Exactness of all the rest. And (2.) That no Intelligent Reader that observed *Estius Annot.* at the end, could think otherwise than that Mr. *D.* took this Quotation of *Calvins* from thence, as he took that of *Epiphanius,* mentioned in his *second Edit. pag.* 58. from *Merning, pag.* 366. And that of *Clements,* mentioned *pag.* 47, 48. from *Jacob Merning:* I hope they will be convinced that the Remark was neither *Fair* nor *Ingenuous.*

4. They take notice, pag. 6. of my charging Mr. *D. with abusing Doctor* Hammond *in affirming that* Βαπτιζω, *signifies an Immersion or Washing of the whole Body, answering the* Hebrew *word*, &c. *Whereas* (say they) *we have examined the Doctors Book, Printed* 53. *and find that Mr.* D. *hath quoted his words truly.* Upon which they remark, *that the mistake is mine, which they hope will convince me of the untrue and unjust Reproach I subjoyned.*

Answ. I do acknowledg that in the *first Edit.* of the Doctors *Annot.* it is, as Mr. *D.* hath quoted it, which I knew not, before he told me so. But in his *second Edit.* and in all latter Editions, it is as I affirmed in my *Appeal.* So then, Impartial Judges will say, Mr. *D.* is to be blamed, if any, for citing words out of a worse *Edit.* when there is a better. And if the *Baptists* please to peruse the Doctors *Review of his Annotations and Paraphrase*, they will see the Correction made by himself. And because of something that I heard was spoken by one of them, at that time when they were examining my *Appeal*, I do now *appeal* to their Consciences, whether they did not know this discrepancy of the *Editions*, before they made their Remark: And how then could they with honesty affirm the mistake to be mine.

5. They tell me, pag. 7. *I charge Mr.* D. *for affirming from* Walden, *that the* Wicklevians *in agreement to the Doctrine of* Pelagius *and others, denied Infant-Baptism, which he acknowledges to be his mistake. But if* Walden (say they) *be to be believed, (it appears) that the* Wicklivists *judged Ecclesiastical-Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words: Nostri* Wicklivistæ *Baptismum Ecclesiasticum inutile judicant parvulis*, &c. — And (say they) we must Remark to you that in your Quotation, *Appeal*, pag. 172. you leave out [*Parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what design or end, we leave you to consider.

Answ. I have already demonstrated, that when *Walden* affirmed the *Wicklevians* judged Ecclesiastical-Baptism unprofitable to little ones, it was only because they denied it to be profitable to their Salvation. As for my leaving out [*Parvulis*] they think it so considerable, that I must hear of it with both Ears. The *Baptists* here tell me of it, and leave me to consider with what design or end I did it. And Mr. *D. Rejoynd.* pag. 33. is so kind, as to tell me plainly, *It was to insinuate to the Reader that they rejected all Baptism, where-*

a that Term expreſly limits it to little ones. But how could Mr. *D.* or his Party, imagine this my deſign, when in both my Books I have aſſerted, and ſtill do, that they were for Infant-Baptiſm? But to Anſwer more particularly, (1.) How can the *Baptiſts* affirm, that [*Parvulis*] was the *principal word* in the Quotation, when Mr. *Danvers* hath given us a Rule that they allow, *Rejoynd.* pag. 21. That in *quoting of Authors, we are obliged to give only what they ſpeak to the thing in hand:* And I brought this of *Walden*, only to prove my charge of his making Authors ſpeak directly contrary to what indeed they affirm. And therefore having quoted them right as to that, as appears by his confeſſing the Charge; they cannot juſtly blame me for other Omiſſions, becauſe I made no further uſe of the words. But (2.) It is *a falſe ſurmiſe*, that by the leaving out that word [*Parvulis*] I could inſinuate to any that underſtand themſelves, that they were againſt all Baptiſm: The Oppoſition confutes it. *Pelagius*, *Vincentius*, and others (ſaith *Walden*) upon ſeveral accounts, held Baptiſm profitable to little ones: But the *Wicklevians* contrary to all theſe mentioned, held it unprofitable [to little ones] muſt neceſſarily be implied by the *Antitheſis*: And my Tranſlation clears it. They judg Eccleſiaſtical-Baptiſm unprofitable, that is ſay I, unprofitable to *their* Salvation. To whoſe Salvation? Let Mr. *D.* or his *Appellants* find another Antecedent, if they can to [their] beſides little ones. And how then can Mr. *D.* prove, *I very unworthily left it out?* I therefore conclude, if this be an Error, it is a Venial one, and I can ſay not wilful. But certainly, theſe Men would make notable work with me, if they had Matter to work upon. But what juſt Cauſe of complaint in this, I profeſs ſeriouſly, I ſee not.

6. They tell me, pag. 8. That I charge Mr. *D. Appeal* pag. 179, 180. for adding thoſe words, *viz.* [*It is our will, that all that affirm that young Children receive everlaſting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace, or Baptiſm renewed,*] *to the* Milevitan Decree. *But examining the* 4. Tom. in Reg. Collect. *they find the Canon quoted by Mr.* Danvers, *in* pag. 559. *taken out of a very antient Copy, immediately following the words, I Cite thus.* [Item placuit ut ſi quis dicit ideo dixiſſe Dominum; in domo Patris mei, Manſiones multæ ſunt, ut intelligatur, quia in Regno Cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vi-

vant

vant Parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt sine quo in Regno Cœlorum, quod est vita æterna intrare non possunt, Anathema sit.] *Now for you to affirm* (say the Baptists) *that the said Clause was of Mr.* D. *his own adding; whereas he says, Here is an express Anathema against those that affirmed Children might be saved without Baptism, is an Instance* (*to give the most favourable Conjecture of it*) *that you have made but a lame search: So that it is very just for us to acquit Mr.* D. *of this Charge*, &c.

Answ. One would wonder how this *Regia Collectio* came into the *Baptists* mind: For Mr. *D.* tells us plainly in his *Treatise*, 2. *Edit. pag.* 105, 106. that he took what he there mentioned of this Canon and Council from the *Magd.* and from no other Author. And therefore in my *Appeal*, I gave them the Canon as it is in the *Magd.* to prove the Addition I charge him with. And it appears I was not mistaken therein, because they go to the 4th *Tom.* in *Reg. Collect.* to find it. But what do they there find? Why, they say, *An express Anathema against those that affirm Children might be saved without Baptism*: In these words,— *item placuit ut si quis dicit*, &c. as above. But herein they are as much mistaken as in other things; and the contrary is apparent from the words. For those against whom this *Anathema* was made, did hold that those Infants, *qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt*, who died without Baptism, *In Regno Cœlorum, quod est vita æterna intrare non possunt*, cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, which is Eternal Life (the very thing I charge Mr. *Danvers* to add). And therefore the *Anathema* is pronounced against them, for thinking notwithstanding there shall be *Aliquis medius aut ullus alicubi locus*, some middle, or other certain place: *Ubi beate vivant parvuli qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt*, &c. Where Children may live happily that die without Baptism; Grounding this their Opinion upon those words of our Saviour, *In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sint*: In my Fathers house are many Mansions. And now I leave it to themselves to consider, whether this is not an Instance (to give the most favourable Conjecture of it) that notwithstanding all their diligence in examining Authors (of which they speak, *pag.* 1.) they have made but a lame search? And whether their *Decree*, which they thought to be so very just, ought not to be now reversed.

7. They

7. They tell me, that under the Head of fathering upon Authors that which they ſay not; I charge him with abuſing *Bazil, Appeal, pag.* 181. in fathering thoſe words upon him: [Muſt the Faithful be ſealed with Baptiſm? Faith muſt needs precede and go before:] Whereas I ſay there was no ſuch ſpeech in what the *Magd.* repeat of *Bazil, contra Eunomium*: Which (ſay they) we conceive to be a very weak Ground for your Charge. For muſt it follow that the words are not *Bazils*, becauſe you find it not in the *Magd.*?

Anſw. (1.) I acknowledge it doth not follow that the words are not *Bazils*, becauſe they are not found in the *Magd.* but had they uſed ſo much diligence in examining things as they pretend to, they would have taken notice of what I ſay, *Vind. pag.* 11. *viz.* The paſſage which Mr. *D.* quotes from *Bazil*, and inſerts in both his Treatiſes of Baptiſm, *viz.* Muſt the Faithful be ſealed with Baptiſm? Faith muſt needs precede and go before. Contra Eunomium, *is not to be found in* Bazil, *for I have peruſed all that he ſaith in reference to Baptiſm, in his* 3. Tomes, *nor have the* Magdiburgs *any ſuch ſaying of his, where they repeat his Doctrine and Sayings*, contra Eunomium, *&c.*

(2.) Let the *Baptiſts* reflect upon what Mr. *D.* ſays, *ſecond Edit. pag.* 55. and they will not judg the Ground of my Charge ſo weak: His words there are— *That the* Magd. *tell us, that it was the Univerſal practice to Baptize the Adult, &c. and for which they give us ſeveral Authorities out of the Learned Fathers, ſome whereof* [that is ſome of thoſe Learned Fathers] *we have as follows*; and this Paſſage of *Bazil* [as he would have us believe] is one of them: I think his fathering that upon the *Magd.* which they have not, is a ſufficient proof of my Charge, though indeed they could find the words in *Bazil*, which they cannot, neither indeed do they affirm; but only that they find his words *to be to that ſenſe*: Which whether they are, or no, let the Reader judg: And alſo whether this is *my* Error and overſight, or *theirs.*

8. And laſtly, They tell me, *I charge him with a notorious Untruth*, pag. 185. *for affirming from the* Magd. *that* Gulielmus *added the* Virgin Mary *to the form of Baptiſm. We have examined the* Magd. (ſay they) Cent. 13. pag. 429. Edit. Bazil, Anno 1574. *and find the words as ſet down by Mr.* D. *And therefore for you to affirm the contrary, is a groſs miſtake.*

Anſw.

Answ. This is such another mistake as that of Dr. *Hammond*, before mentioned. I confess that in the *first Edit.* of the 7th *Vol.* the *Virgin Mary* is added to the form of Baptism, but in the last of the 3d *Vol.* it is omitted: And I knew not the discrepancy between the Editions before I read it in Mr. *D.* his *Rejoynd.* And I presume all indifferent Men will conclude, had I known it, I should not have made this one of my Instances. But it is probable, the *Baptists* will reply, you quote the Page of the *first Edit.* and therefore must needs take it from thence. I acknowledg that Page is mentioned, and it was occasioned by several of Mr. *D*'s Quotations, in that 13. *Cent.* of his *second Edit. pag.* 123. viz. *Aquinas* twice, and *Bonaventure*, all which had the 419th Page quoted for them. And these being just about this of *Gulielmus*, wrought a presumption, that this also was in the same Page, and so accordingly it was set down. This is the very truth, though I confess, it would have been better to have mentioned the Edition out of which it was taken, that there might have been no Ground for a Censure.

Thus I have examined the *Baptists* Answer, and now leave it to the determination of the Christian Reader, whether indeed, they have answered my *Appeal* as they ought, or given a true or Impartial Representation of these particular Matters, which they were pleased to take Cognizance of, so as to make it appear to the satisfaction of all Impartial Persons (as they speak) that my Charges do not appear to be true, but on the contrary great Mistakes, such as do oblige them to acquit Mr. *D.* and to call upon me to make good my Promise in the Preface to my *Appeal.*

FINIS.